UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/524,996 | 02/18/2005 | Hiroyuki Asada | 05105/HG | 3212 |
| | 7590 07/16/200 OLTZ, GOODMAN & | EXAMINER | | |
| 220 Fifth Aven | - | WEBB, WALTER E | | |
| 16TH Floor NEW YORK, N | NY 10001-7708 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , | | 1609 | | |
| | | | F | |
| | • | · | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/16/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application N | lo. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | | 10/524,996 | | ASADA ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | | Walter E. Wet | | 1609 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE Period for Reply | E of this communication ap | pears on the co | ver sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | ldress | | | |
| WHICHEVER IS LONGEI - Extensions of time may be availat after SIX (6) MONTHS from the m - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or expenses. | above, the maximum statutory period ktended period for reply will, by statute ater than three months after the mailin | ATE OF THIS 136(a). In no event, h will apply and will exp e, cause the application | COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be timulated the SIX (6) MONTHS from the to become ABANDONE! | I. lely filed the mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | • | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to com | munication(s) filed on 18 F | ebruary 2005 | | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINA | | | | | • | | | |
| ′ <u> </u> | , _ | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are _l | pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above cla | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/a | re allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are i | Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/a | | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are | subject to restriction and/o | or election requ | irement. | | • | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is | objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed | 0)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 February 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not req | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| | sheet(s) including the correc | • | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declarat | ion is objected to by the Ex | xaminer. Note t | he attached Office | Action or form P | ΓO-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 | 19 | | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is a)⊠ All b)□ Some * | made of a claim for foreigr c)☐ None of: | n priority under | 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(d) or (f). | | | | |
| 1. ☐ Certified copi | es of the priority document | ts have been re | ceived. | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copi | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | |
| • • | om the International Burea | • | , ,, | | | | | |
| * See the attached det | ailed Office action for a list | of the certified | copies not receive | d. | . • | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | , | , | 7 | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (P' Notice of Draftsperson's Pater | | 4) [| Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application | | | | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :09/20/2005, 05/17/2005, 02/18/2005.

Application/Control Number: 10/524,996

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-4 are pending.

Claims 1-4 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
 Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (US 6,011,062).
- 3. Schneider et al. teach an ophthalmic solution comprising a prostaglandin at 0.001 to 0.005% at pH 6 +/- 0.2. (See col. 9, Example 2 (table).) (Schneider teaches that latanoprost can be used in that invention in column 5, line 57.) Claims 1 and 2 of applicant's invention encompasses the example taught in Schneider et al., and have therefore been anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Application/Control Number: 10/524,996 Page 3

Art Unit: 1609

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. (US 6,011,062) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Inada et al. (US 5,916,550).
- 6. In claim 3, applicant claims the same concentration range for latanoprost as in claim 2, but adds epsilon-aminocaproic acid at a range of 0.1 to 2% (W/V). In claim 4, applicant specifies the latanoprost concentration is 0.005% (W/V) and epsilon-aminocaproic acid is 1% (W/V) (See col. 2, lines 10-15). Schneider et al. does not teach the epsilon-aminocaproic acid. However, Inada et al. teach an ophthalmic solution containing epsilon-aminocaproic acid at concentration of 0.002 to 2% (W/V). A person having ordinary skill in the are would appreciate having latanoprost at 0.005% and epsilon-aminocaproic acid at 1% given the fact that the prior art teaches a range that encompasses these concentrations.
- 7. At the time of applicants invention, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the latanoprost of Schneider with the epsilon-aminocaproic acid of Inada especially when both have been taught in the prior art as major ingredients in ophthalmic solutions.
- 8. No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kararli et al. (US 20020035264) teach that drugs having utility as a topical ophthalmic application can be used in co-therapy, co-

Art Unit: 1609

administration or co-formulation. Such drugs include latanoprost and aminocaproic acid. See para. 0350, pg. 15 of specification.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter E. Webb whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:00pm Mon-Fri EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

JEFFREY STUCKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER